



**CMAQ Project Selection Committee**  
**Minutes – Thursday September 14, 2017**

- Committee Members:** Douglas Ferguson, Chair (CMAP), Darwin Burkhart (IEPA via phone), John Donovan (FHWA), Tony Greep (FTA), Keith Privett (CDOT), Christopher Schmidt (IDOT), Chris Snyder (Counties), Mark Pitstick (RTA)
- Staff Present:** Jesse Elam, Tom Kotarac, Jen Maddux, Kevin Peralta
- Others Present:** Frank Acevedo, Tim Coffey, Laura Fedak (via phone), Emily Karry, Steve Manella, Brian Pigeon, Tom Rickert, Brian Stepp, Mike Sullivan, Brian Urbaszewski, Mike Walczak, Michael Weiser

**1.0 Call to Order**

Mr. Ferguson called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

**2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements**

Mr. Ferguson noted that there were no agenda changes.

**3.0 Approval of Minutes – July 20, 2017**

On a motion by Mr. Pitstick and seconded by Mr. Snyder, the minutes of the July 20, 2017 meeting were approved.

**4.0 Program Monitoring**

**4.1 Project Programming Status Sheets**

Mr. Ferguson acknowledged that Mr. Privett suggested in the July 20, 2017 meeting that only line items with deferred funds not expended should be included on the deferred summary report. Mr. Ferguson reported that staff had not produced the aforementioned report, but offered to discuss further at a later date.

**4.2 Programming Summary and Obligation Goal**

In reference to the July 20, 2017 meeting, Mr. Ferguson stated that staff had been making attempts to address some of the anomalies regarding the numbers related to rescission in the obligation goals spreadsheet but are still working to align program changes. The obligation goals spreadsheet was not included in the meeting's packet. There was only a slight increase in obligations since the last Committee meeting. Staff is concerned because the region has only obligated \$51 million of its \$103 million goal for FFY 2017. The programming status sheets show

that \$116 million was programmed for FFY 2017, but the region is still not meeting the obligation goal. As of May, there were more than enough sponsors indicating that they would have their projects ready, however not much progress was made since the May status updates. Mr. Ferguson then asked for feedback from the committee regarding potential solutions to the low obligation rate.

Mr. Pitstick noted that large projects programmed in out years were moved forward on an ad hoc basis, and the Committee approved just about every request. Mr. Ferguson concurred and noted that staff encouraged sponsors to move projects forward. A more direct public address to sponsors may be needed to inform them that projects programmed in out years do not necessarily have to wait and can move ahead when ready. He noted that some large projects were caught in the GATA process, but that should not be an issue moving forward as GATA is now built into the project development process.

## 5.0 Project Changes

### 5.1 **Schaumburg – Schaumburg and Barrington Roads Intersection Improvements (TIP ID 03-00-0108)**

Ms. Maddux reported that the sponsor is requesting a transfer of \$67,000 from construction to right-of-way due to lower construction costs and higher right-of-way costs resulting from the condemnation process. On a motion made by Mr. Pitstick and seconded by Mr. Schmidt, the requested transfer was approved.

### 5.2 **Homer Glen – Homer Glen Community Trail – South Extension (TIP ID 12-12-0002)**

Ms. Maddux reported that the sponsor is requesting a transfer of \$3,200 federal from phase 1 engineering and \$6,400 federal from phase 2 engineering to construction and a cost increase of \$38,400 federal for construction, due to revised path alignment and additional construction costs. The project was re-ranked but no change in rank occurred; 15 other funded projects ranked lower. On a motion made by Mr. Privett and seconded by Mr. Snyder, the requested transfers and cost increase were approved.

### 5.3 **Forest Preserve District of Will County – Black Road Shared Use Path from Des Plaines River Trail to Rock Run Trail (TIP ID 12-14-0016)**

Ms. Maddux reported that the Forest Preserve District of Will County is requesting a cost increase of \$246,540 for FFY 2017 due to added soil remediation, increased construction costs after the final plans were reviewed. The project is on the November letting and added that staff recommends approval. On a motion made by Mr. Schmidt and seconded by Mr. Snyder, the requested scope change and cost change were approved.

After approval, Mr. Pitstick asked for quick clarification about how a change in budget now will affect funding in the future after the November letting. He asked more specifically about how the money for the project would be handled in terms of programming should the case of overfunding or underfunding of the project occur.

Mr. Ferguson answered with clarity about the policy set in place in 2015 that 10% contingency costs are left programmed on projects that come in under the programmed amounts and the remaining funds are reprogrammed.

## **6.0 CMAQ/TAP-L Call for Projects**

Mr. Ferguson reported that the proposed CMAQ and TAP programs had been released for a public comment period of 30 days which had ended on September 4. A total of eight comments had been received, which were summarized and included in the memo attached to the meeting materials. The actual comments as received were posted online on the CMAQ and TAP program development page.

Mr. Ferguson noted that the first four comments received were in support of the Pace Pulse Line project along Dempster Street; this project was included in the proposed program and there were no proposed changes to the program.

Mr. Ferguson moved on to the next comment from the Village of Barrington with concerns about the US 14 underpass of the CN tracks. He stated that the project was not included in the proposed program and noted that Mayor Darch expressed concern over the stated analysis of rankings that gave an overall perspective that the project was not worth pursuing. Mr. Ferguson stated that staff appreciates the mayor's concern, and the primary purpose of the evaluation is the ability of projects to reduce VOC emissions, rather than being a general evaluation of the project's worthiness. Mayor Darch requested that the project selection committee reexamine the overall project costs in the development of cost per kilogram of VOC eliminated. Staff intends to work with the Village of Barrington to understand what the Village would like to see here as it reviews changes to the program for the next cycle. Mr. Ferguson stated that there are no recommendations for changes to the program based on the comment received.

Mr. Ferguson reported that there was another comment received from the TMA of Lake-Cook on its application for the last mile market shuttle demonstration project sponsored by Lake County. He stated that the project was not included in the proposed program. It was requested that the Committee revisit the benefits of the project and consider funding it. He stated that while staff believed the project deserved some merit, it ranked third among other projects with a cost per kilogram of VOC eliminated of just under \$6,000. He noted for comparison that the second ranked project did receive funding, and had a cost per kilogram of VOC eliminated of just under \$3,000. He further noted the large difference in cost benefit between the two projects. As a result, he stated that it would not be appropriate to include the project in the program at the time. In addition to the higher cost per kilogram of VOC eliminated, the project proposed identifying and developing transit markets. He noted that this leaves the benefits of the project in question. Mr. Ferguson stated that there are no recommendations for changes to the program based on the comment received.

Mr. Ferguson reported that the last two comments received were from the Respiratory Health Association and the Environmental Law and Policy Center with regards to the Metra locomotive acquisition and rehabilitation. He stated that the project was included

in the proposed program. The comments received expressed concern over technology proposed in Metra's application and requested that projects receiving CMAQ funding meet the U.S. EPA Tier IV standard for locomotives.

Mr. Ferguson stated that staff did contact Metra to receive feedback and noted that Metra had stated that if they were to upgrade to Tier IV standards, new locomotives would have to be purchased. Under the currently proposed project, Metra is purchasing used locomotives and proposing to meet Tier II plus or Tier III standards at a minimum. Mr. Ferguson stated that at this point staff does not recommend making any changes. He then mentioned that the next step is to recommend the proposed program to the Transportation Committee and opened the floor to questions and comments.

Mr. Urbaszewski of the Respiratory Health Association commented that there are remanufactured Tier IV passenger locomotives in service as of the present day, and that they have been in service for 18 months in Toronto, Canada. He stated that he thinks Metra is incorrect to say that new locomotives would have to be purchased in order to meet the Tier IV standards and questioned why Tier IV was not originally included in the specifications in the RFP. He stated that he is concerned about the potential inability of the current locomotives to conform to cleaner standards even if they were retrofitted. He stated that he wants to know why the region is not requiring higher standards for their locomotives when other regions do.

Mr. Stepp of Metra stated that there has not been a successful proposer to provide Tier IV locomotives. He noted that the RFP is written to allow for any proposer providing Tier IV locomotives to conform to Metra's specifications, and added that Metra would then receive fewer locomotives if those purchased were either remanufactured or new. Mr. Stepp stated that Metra is actively trying to address the emissions from the current, unregulated locomotives. He continued that if a successful bidder proposed a Tier IV remanufactured locomotive, Metra would gladly consider.

Mr. Donovan of FHWA interjected with a question regarding the number of locomotives being proposed. Mr. Ferguson answered that there were originally 28 proposed in the application, but the reduced federal award leaves the actual number at 16.

Mr. Stepp stated that if Metra is able to maintain the amount of capital funds that are currently available with state assistance, they have Metra funds committed to locomotive acquisition and replacement, and it is possible to acquire up to 24 locomotives, perhaps up to the full 28 with additional future funds. He added that Metra can only guarantee the 16 locomotives with current CMAQ funding and the Metra match. He further added that there are currently 24 locomotives at the end of their useful life that the agency is trying to replace, and that being held to Tier IV standards would only allow for 12 locomotives, the other 12 would undergo a 10-year, life-extending rebuild at Tier 0 plus.

Questions from committee members included the difference in benefit delivery from Tier II and Tier III as well as commitment to exploring options in terms of total emission

reductions from Mr. Snyder, the Counties' representative, and Mr. Acevedo of the US EPA respectively.

Mr. Stepp replied saying Metra estimates that there will be a greater return on investment in acquiring the 24 locomotives at Tier III and from the locomotives manufactured at Tier II plus. He added that Metra estimates there would be a drop of one third in terms of PM reduction if pursuing a 24 Tier II plus and Tier III locomotives option over the 12 Tier IV locomotive option. He continued by saying that NOx reduction would be less with the 12 new locomotives but PM is where a larger difference is seen. He added that NOx is more difficult to reduce. He further noted that the specifications in the RFP have been written to allow for the most competitive option, citing funding as an issue with obtaining cleaner, more expensive locomotives.

Mr. Donovan asked if there is an analysis available to identify the greatest return on investment between the two options and if Tier II plus is a minimum requirement in Metra's RFP.

Mr. Ferguson answered that there is no analysis available. He was followed in response by Mr. Stepp who confirmed that Tier II plus is a minimum requirement. Mr. Stepp added that Metra believes the Tier III remanufactured option will be the most competitive.

Mr. Privett asked if there was a possibility for Metra to come back to the Committee with a cost increase if the cost differential between Tier III and Tier IV was reasonably small.

Mr. Stepp replied stating that the cost differential per locomotive is substantial, roughly \$2 million, but is willing to consider and collaborate with CMAP staff. He added that if a Tier IV proposal is among the pool of bidders and is otherwise qualified, Metra would look further into obtaining CMAQ funding to acquire the cleaner locomotives. He added that Tier IV proposals would not be dropped due solely to cost; additional funds would be sought.

Mr. Urbaszewski added that remanufactured Tier IV will be more expensive, but will have a useful life of 30-40 years of lower emissions. He cited that lower Tier options would have greater emissions levels and asserted that Metra needs to push forward to be a leader in emissions reduction, advocating for the best use of public money for public health.

Mr. Stepp added that it would be ideal to remanufacture and perform life-extending rebuilds on the locomotives after roughly 25 years. He further added that by that time Metra would be able to employ technology to improve emissions. He said that CMAQ funding has been used to rebuild older locomotives that were originally Tier 0 in order to upgrade to Tier II and Tier III.

On a motion made by Mr. Snyder and seconded by Mr. Privett, the motion to approve the proposed program for Transportation Committee consideration carried.

#### **7.0 FAST Act**

Mr. Donovan indicated that there was nothing new to discuss regarding the FAST Act.

#### **8.0 Other Business**

Mr. Schmidt from IDOT made the announcement for a save-the-date for a GATA workshop and distributed information to the Committee.

#### **9.0 Public Comment**

Mr. Urbaszewski expressed concerns over the CMAQ funded Metra switcher locomotive remanufacturer project. The project was originally program in 2010 to remanufacture two switcher engines to a Genset configuration and in 2014 Metra received a scope change to change from Genset technology to a more conventional locomotive meeting Tier III requirements for emissions reductions. The recent RFP issued by Metra only required for Tier II+ standards and is concerned that the project will not meet the approved scope.

Mr. Ferguson stated that staff had been investigating the matter; putting out an RFP does not go against anything that was originally proposed—noting that nothing had been awarded yet. He added that he is discussing the matter with federal partners to ensure everything is done correctly.

Mr. Stepp noted that he had not reviewed the specifications to the proposal but will look into the matter and issue an addendum as needed.

#### **10.0 Next Meeting**

Mr. Ferguson stated that the Committee’s next meeting is scheduled for November 2, 2017 at 2:00 p.m.

#### **11.0 Adjournment**

On a motion made by Ms. Schmidt and seconded by Mr. Snyder, the meeting was adjourned at 2:46 p.m.

#### **CMAQ Project Selection Committee Members:**

\_\_\_\_ Darwin Burkhart

\_\_\_\_ Mark Pitstick

\_\_\_\_ Chris Schmidt

\_\_\_\_ Luann Hamilton

\_\_\_\_ Jeffery Schielke

\_\_\_\_ Chris Snyder

\_\_\_\_ Douglas Ferguson, Chair